

**From:** [Ron Gouquet](#)  
**To:** [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Robert Neely](#)  
**Subject:** Re: FEDERAL FAMILY - Any input on this?  
**Date:** 06/26/2006 12:00 PM

---

I'm cool, but for why only go to sensitivity if we catch enough ammocoetes? If this:

If we catch them they are exposed, so we test sensitivity (with hatchery ammocoetes in a sensitivity comparison battery of 96hr water only exposures ...), if we don't catch 'em they ain't exposed, so no need to do sensitivity...

OR

If we catch 'em & we catch enough (~100s?) we use PH caught ammocoetes in a sensitivity comparison battery of 96hr water only exposures, if we don't catch 'em they ain't exposed, so no need to do sensitivity...

OR

Get samples with shocker/sucker & do composite ammocoete tissue analysis. Compare tissue values to critical tissue value (CTV aka 'tissue TRV') tested by a battery of 96hr water only exposures with hatchery ammocoetes in a sensitivity comparison ?

Rest seems good by me, just confuzed on the ammocoete dealie...

Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> Ron,  
>  
> I may have missed something being out of the office last Friday, but I  
> don't recall EPA agreeing to sturgeon sensitivity studies. Just got off  
> the phone with Eric Blischke, he doesn't remember that either. I'm  
> sending you this e-mail with Eric's knowledge. Can't find Joe Goulet at  
> the moment to see if I'm missing something. As is often the case with  
> EI, we all need to very carefully parse their wording and see if we  
> agree with it. Except for their bullet number 1 (the lamprey ammocoete  
> studies, which seems an accurate description to me), I'd be careful  
> about believing the remaining bullets accurately reflect EPA's position  
> for now. Number 2 (lamprey adults for human health purposes) is  
> probably close to the mark, although I don't know how strongly Dan feels  
> they should not be part of the RI/FS, or how strongly the EPA human  
> health risk assessors feel additional lamprey adults are needed. Bullet  
> 3 (sturgeon sensitivity testing) is the one Eric and I don't recall  
> being the EPA position, but again, maybe my being out last Friday caused  
> me to miss something. I'm not sure what to make of EI's bullet 4.  
>  
> Interesting front page article in the Portland Oregonian yesterday about  
> the politics of the Grand Ronde Tribe if you haven't already seen it.  
>  
> Best regards,  
>  
> Burt Shephard  
> Risk Evaluation Unit  
> Office of Environmental Assessment (OEA-095)  
> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10  
> 1200 6th Avenue  
> Seattle, WA 98101  
>  
> Telephone: (206) 553-6359  
> Fax: (206) 553-0119  
>  
> e-mail: Shephard.Burt@epa.gov  
>  
>  
>